



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,692	11/26/2003	James B. McCormick	46521-56177	8923
<div>21888 7590 01/29/2008</div> <div>THOMPSON COBURN, LLP</div> <div>ONE US BANK PLAZA</div> <div>SUITE 3500</div> <div>ST LOUIS, MO 63101</div>				
			<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>RAMILLANO, LORE JANET</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT</div> <div>1797</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>NOTIFICATION DATE</div> <div>01/29/2008</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE</div> <div>ELECTRONIC</div>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

IPDOCKET@THOMPSONCOBURN.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/723,692	Applicant(s) MCCORMICK, JAMES B.	
	Examiner Lore Ramillano	Art Unit 1797	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 1/7/08 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: none.
Claim(s) objected to: none.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-7.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 8-10.


AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments are not persuasive. First, applicant should note that this application contains claims 8-10 drawn to an invention nonelected without traverse in the reply filed on 4/6/07. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01. Furthermore, examiner would like to clarify the examiner's statements made on applicant's voicemail. Examiner suggested to applicant to submit his proposed amendments in writing (i.e. After Final Amendment) and examiner will consider such amendments. With regard to the Examiner's Amendment comment, examiner does not recall suggesting or implying that she will allow the case. Examiner told applicant that she will consider the amendments filed by applicant, and not that she will allow the case if the amendments were filed in a After Final Amendment. In response to applicant's argument that Dyke does not anticipate applicant's invention because Dyke discloses a material which is impermeable to microorganisms, and thus, Dyke's material would not be permeable to fluids, examiner disagrees. With respect to the recited term, "fluid," it will given its broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the disclosure. According to the disclosure in para. [0018], as cited by applicant, it appears that the disclosure broadly describes the type of materials that can be used in applicant's invention. While this cited disclosure recites that "the sheet is porous to the typical processing fluids used in histological preparation," such language does not appear sufficient to overcome the material used in Dyke's invention since his material is permeable to fluids, such as gases and ethylene oxide (i.e. col. 3, lines 16-21). In addition, applicant should note that it is improper to read limitations of the specification into a claim. In response to applicant's argument that Dyke and Rochette function in a totally different manner with fluid impermeability than as disclosed in the Applicant's claimed invention, examiner does not find this argument convincing. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. Here, because the combination of Dyke and Rochette read on the structural limitations recited in applicant's claims, Dyke and Rochette properly read on the intended use language recited in applicant's claims.


Jill Warden
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700